



Graves Garrett LLC

Edward D. Greim
Direct Dial: (816) 256-4144
edgreim@gravesgarrett.com

January 2, 2020

VIA ECF

Hon. Debra Freeman
Daniel Patrick Moynihan Courthouse
Courtroom 17A
500 Pearl Street
New York, New York 10007

**Re: Eastern Profit Corp. Ltd. v. Strategic Vision US, LLC, Case No. 18-cv-2185 (JGK)-DCF
Sur-Reply to Je's Reply to Response to Motion to Quash Subpoena to Google (ECF 230)**

Dear Judge Freeman:

Defendant/Counterclaimant Strategic Vision US, LLC, responds to the reply in support of the Motion to Quash (ECF 230) filed Friday by William Je (a/k/a Je Kin Ming), solely to address a point Je omitted from his Motion, and then raised belatedly in his reply: that subpoena Request No. 6, which seeks information covered by the Google Privacy Policy, is supposedly a sweeping request for the contents of Je's account. Contrary to Je's new claim, Strategic Vision does *not* seek, and Google does *not* plan to produce, the contents of Mr. Je's account or communications. Request No. 6 is neither being enforced by Strategic nor complied with by Google.

Counsel for Strategic informed Mr. Je's counsel of this fact repeatedly, including on Monday, December 23, before Je's motion was filed, explaining that the subpoenaed information would *not* include the contents of Mr. Je's emails or other information in which he might claim a privacy interest. *See Ex. A.*¹ This assurance was based on Strategic Vision's discussions with Google, which occurred well before Mr. Je objected. During a phone call on December 11, counsel for Strategic informed Google that its subpoena for the Gmail account did not seek contents, and also provided Google with the protective order. *See Ex. B.* Google confirmed that its response, if no objection was received, would merely be "basic subscriber information," and not contents of communications. *See Ex. C.* Strategic did not intend to seek, and Google indeed will not produce, the contents of Mr. Je's communications or other items under Request 6. *See id.*

Respectfully submitted,

Edward D. Greim
Attorney for Defendant/Counterclaimant

cc: Counsel of record via ECF

¹ Counsel for Mr. Je is well aware that the subpoena does not seek the contents of Mr. Je's communications: his principal motion to quash, ECF No. 227, did not even allege Strategic was seeking the contents of Mr. Je's account, leaving Strategic Vision no way to have addressed it in the Response.